DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 107 SP 023 814

AUTHOR Hukill, Hobart; Hughes, G. Robert, Jr.
TITLE Teachers for Tomorrow.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9049
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Cooperating Teachers; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Futures (of Society); Preservice Teacher Education; Standardized Tests; *Student Teachers; Student Teaching; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS Student Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Much concern has been voiced about the quality of teachers newly entering the profession, the teachers of tomorrow. This concern has focused either on teachers' low aptitude and achievement scores or on their low grade point averages. However, numerous other personal and professional characteristics have been shown to be important to successful teaching, including empathy, flexibility, self-esteem, locus of control, conceptual level, educational preference, and teacher concerns. A study was undertaken to provide a comprehensive description of teachers for tomorrow, the student teachers of today. Subjects for this study were 93 student teachers and 88 cooperating teachers. Nine instruments and a background survey were administered to student teachers and cooperating teachers to measure the aforementioned qualities for successful teaching. Most of the instruments were administered at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience. Study results showed few substantive differences between today's teachers and tomorrow's teachers. Tomorrow's teachers remain predominantly Anglo and female. They come from predominantly middle class backgrounds, though substantial numbers of them attended ethnically mixed secondary schools, somewhat more than today's teachers. Differences that do exist are in the area of workplace concerns, as well as in the expected lower standardized intelligence scores. (JMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240107

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

TEACHERS FOR TOMORROW

Hobart Hukill and G. Robert Hughes, Jr.

Report No. 9049

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Montreal, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

April 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 023 814

TEACHERS FOR TOMORROW

Rationale of the Study

Widespread public concern has been voiced concerning the quality of the teachers newly entering the profession, our teachers for tomorrow. Much of this concern has focused either on new teachers' low aptitude and achievement scores (see, for example, Feistritzer, O'Rourke, Howey, Lebby, & Yarger, 1983) or on their low GPA's (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). However, numerous other personal and professional characteristics have been shown to be important to successful teaching. These include empathy, flexibility, self-esteem, locus of control, conceptual level, educational preference, and teacher concerns. Unfortunately, much of the current discussion of new teachers' quality rests on the rather narrow basis of standardized aptitude test scores such as the SAT or various intelligence measures and GPA. The study reported here was undertaken to provide a more comprehensive description than currently exists of teachers for tomorrow, the student teachers of today. (For a more extensive report of the study see Griffin, Barnes, Hughes, O'Neal, Defino, Edwards, and Hukill, Note 1). In order to address the issue of progressive decline in the quality of incoming teachers, the student teachers were compared with those already in the profession, their cooperating teachers, on the above-mentioned characteristics. While not discounting the disparities between new teachers and those already in the field on standardized scores and GPA's, the findings of this study should help to balance the image of uniform decline so often presented in discussions of new teacher quality.

Regarding empathy, Carkhuff (1971) reported that counselors who exhibit high empathic listening skills have more successful therapy outcomes. Similarly, LaMonica (1981) reported that more empathic nurses are viewed as

more caring and helpful by patients. In education conventional wisdom also holds that empathy is an important attribute of teachers. Goldhammer (1964) and Cogan (1973) also advocated that cooperating teachers need to exhibit empathy in working with their student teachers.

Internal locus of control has been related to the ability to make decisions and perform tasks independently (Robinson & Shaver, 1975). In the teacher-centered, self-contained classroom this is an obviously important personality attribute for the teacher.

Conceptual level, a domain of cognitive development, has been shown to be related to the ability of teachers to learn and apply a variety of teaching styles (Joyce, Weil, & Wald, 1973). Hunt and his associates (1974) found that teachers' conceptual level is related to conceptual flexibility, stress tolerance, and adaptability. Of particular importance to teachers in multicultural settings, Harvey and his associates (1966) reported that conceptual level is related to teacher effectiveness with students from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Hunt (1975) replicated this finding as well. Conceptual level is also related to their ability to perceive and resolve contradictions (Harvey, Hunt, & Schroder, 1961).

The educational philosophies of teachers will logically affect their educational practice. Lacefield and Cole (Note ?) have proposed that teachers' philosophies can be measured on a continuum from traditional to progressive and that this will relate to their classroom practice (rule-and-content-centered versus process-centered).

Flexibility has been shown to be important in teacher education (Ekstrom, 1976). Hunt and Joyce (1967), for example, found that more effective teachers displayed a wider range of teaching styles.

Self-esteem has been related to teachers' overall mental health (Milgram and Milgram, 1976) and to their students' achievement (Rayder, Abrams, & Larson, 1978). Soares and Soares (1968) found that student teachers' self-esteem was related to their university supervisor ratings. Garvey (1970) also reported similar findings.

Fuller (1969) argued that the concerns of teachers regarding themselves, their day-to-day teaching tasks, and their impact on student learning are very important to the teachers' practice. She further proposed a developmental sequence in which, beginning with self concerns, the new teacher will move through these areas of concern, ultimately arriving at impact concerns.

In addition to the teacher characteristics just discussed, a measure of general intelligence (Borgatta & Corsini, 1964) and a measure of cognitive style (Witkin, Oltman, Raskin, & Karp, 1970) were taken in order to address the public concern for these standardized, achievement-related variables.

The social, economic, ethnic, and educational backgrounds of teachers will also very likely influence their teaching practice, most importantly perhaps in socioeconomic and/or ethnic settings different from their own. Unfortunately, this information has not been systematically collected and analyzed. In one of the only studies of its kind, Yarger, Howey, and Joyce (1977) obtained demographic profiles on 2200 student teachers, concluding that the typical student teacher is a single, Anglo woman in her early 20's. Because of its possible importance, background information was collected for all participants in this study as well.

Method

Participants

Preservice students who were just entering the clinical component of their training and their cooperating teachers participated in the study.

Forty-four student teachers from a large public university did student teaching in a medium-sized school district. Also, 49 student teachers from a large, private university did their student teaching in a large urban school district. The cooperating teachers (N = 88) who supervised these student teachers also participated in this study. Participants were drawn from both elementary and secondary levels.

Instruments

Empathy Construct Rating Scale (Empathy). The empathy construct focuses on the helper-client relationship and is defined as follows: "Empathy signifies a central focus and feeling with and in the client's world. It involves accurate perception of the client's work by the helper, communication of this understanding to the client, and the client's perception of the helper's understanding" (LaMonica, 1981, p. 398). The original 84-item scale was developed to measure empathy among nursing and health care professional (LaMonica, 1981). It is a self-report, Likert-response instrument which LaMonica validated through Campbell and Fiske's (1959) multitrait-multimethod approach. It was found to have good discriminant validity and high internal consistency (.96), though convergent validity was not apparent (not unusual when measuring one personality construct by different methods and types of response tasks). A shorter, 23-item version (internal consistency coefficient alpha = .87) was adapted by the RITE staff from the original for use in the study.

James Internal-External Locus of Control Short Form (Locus of Control). Rotter (1966) defines locus of control as the degree to which individuals believe that their lives are within their control. The James instrument consists of 11 self-report items in Likert-response format. Robinson and Shaver (1973) report split-half reliabilities from .84 to .96 and test-retest

reliabilities from .71 to .86 in intervals from three months to one year. They also report evidence of concurrent validity, with the James instrument correlating with the Rotter IE Scale at .64, though there is evidence that these locus of control instruments differ somewhat in the domains which they measure (Borich & Paver, 1978).

Different Situations Adaptation Scale (Flexibility). The flexibility construct measured by this instrument relates to the capacity to change and to tolerate differences in interpersonal, social settings (Hughes, Griffin, & Defino, Note 3). Thus, it contrasts with more cognitive, intrapsychic constructs of flexibility such as Guilford's (1967) divergent thinking or Witkin's (Witkin, Goodenough, & Oltman, Note 4) cognitive style. Rehfish's (1958) Rigidity Scale was modified by the addition of 26 behaviorally-oriented items (for example, "Is uncomfortable in situations in which differences of opinion are aired."). These new items were placed in a Likert-response format. The expanded version, retitled the Different Situations Adaptation Scale (Hughes, et al., Note 3), was pilot-tested with a sample of 63 classroom teachers. Those items with the lowest inter-item and item-scale correlations were removed, resulting in a 17-item instrument (alpha = .89). Convergent and discriminant validity was established using the Campbell and Fiske (1959) multitrait-multimethod design.

Self-Perception Inventory--Teacher Form (Self-Esteem). This instrument measures self-esteem as a function of the system of perceptions which a teacher formulates as part of an awareness of himself/herself as a teacher (Soares & Soares, 1980). These perceptions might be generally positive or negative, higher or lower, but are comprised of both positive and negative valences. Thirty-six pairs of dichotomous traits (adjectives) are in a semantic differential, Likert-response format. The 72 traits were selected

from lists of personality traits related to teaching that were compiled by six groups: (1) elementary and secondary public school students; (2) student teachers; (3) university supervisors of student teaching; (4) classroom teachers; (5) expert educators; and, (6) personality researchers. The traits were selected on the basis of agreement among the groups, teaching effectiveness research, and subsequent pilot-testing (Soares & Soares, 1980). Test-retest reliability at an interval of four weeks is .89. The authors cite evidence of concurrent validity: SPI with ratings of internship competence ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), and predictive validity, with ratings of on-the-job success ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). The alpha coefficient computed from the current data was .91 (Hughes & Hukill, Note 5).

Paragraph Completion Test (Conceptual Level). The PCT is a measure of adult development which is based on the Conceptual Systems Theory of Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder (1961). The model was developed in the contexts of staff development, teaching, and counseling and it describes a regular series of stages (conceptual levels) through which individuals move. It is assumed that the way in which a person organizes his or her world, not only the physical objects in it, but particularly the interpersonal relationships, determines and reflects the conceptual level of that person. The PCT is designed to tap the ways in which a person organizes his or her interpersonal world and, thus, to show the conceptual level at which the person functions (Schroder, Driver, & Streufert, 1967). The subject is asked to write two or three sentences in response to each of five sentence items. Each item presents either control or constraint ("What I think about rules..."), discrepancy ("When I am criticized..."), or uncertainty ("When I am not sure...") to which most subjects respond with an attempt at resolution. Schroder, et al., (1967) report that such resolution responses result in high inter-rater reliability

and construct validity. Item-test correlations range from .57 to .75. Split-half reliability is .70. Intra-rater reliability coefficients of the PCT scoring from the present study range from .90 to .93.

Group Embedded Figures Test (Cognitive Style). This instrument is one of several developed by Witkin and his associates as a perceptual measure of field dependence-independence, more generally referred to as cognitive style or differentiation (Witkin, Oltman, Raskin, & Karp, 1971). The GEFT is an adaptation of the original EFT which permits more flexible administration. In both versions the subject is presented with a series of complex figures each of which incorporates a simple figure. The subject's task is to identify the incorporated simple figure. The original EFT, requiring individual administration, has been extensively validated (Witkin, et al., 1971). The GEFT which does not require individual administration is closely modeled on the original EFT, with 17 of its 18 complex figures taken from the EFT. (Seven other Gottschaldt figures comprise a warm-up section which is not scored.) The 18 items are divided into two comparable sections of nine each. Witkin, et al. (1981) report a correlation of .82 between the two sections. Evidence of concurrent validity is provided by correlations of -.82 (males) and -.63 (females) of GEFT with the parent EFT (the correlations should be negative because the EFT is scored in reverse fashion).

Quick Word Test (Vocabulary and Intelligence). This instrument assesses vocabulary level for the purpose of quickly estimating general intelligence (Borgatta & Corsini, 1964). It is based on the assumption held by psychometricians that the understanding of the meanings of words is the best single indicator of mental ability. The QWT is a 100-item multiple choice vocabulary measure. It has been found to have consistently high reliability (.90's for split-halves and alternate forms), and it correlates (.80's) with

the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale and with other measures of general intelligence (Grotelveschen & Knox, 1967).

Educational Preference Scale (Educational Preferences). This instrument measures an individual's position between the philosophical poles of traditionalism and process-centered progressivism. A short story is presented in which a young boy is shown two approaches to education--one traditional, the other process-centered. Both approaches are presented in a positive light. The story is accompanied by opposing pairs of statements about the purposes and roles of students, teachers and learning. Respondents indicate their positions between the bipolar statements via a five-point Likert-response scale. Lacefield and Mahan (1980) report internal consistency of .85. High scores on the EPS (process-centered) are negatively correlated (-.34) with high scores on Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and are positively correlated (.45) with the progressive education end of the Education Scale. Furthermore, the EPS accurately discriminated between four groups of preservice and inservice teachers which were previously determined to range from traditional to progressive (Lacefield and Cole, Note 2).

Teacher Concerns Checklist (Self, Task, Impact). This instrument is based on Fuller's (1969) Concerns Theory which states that initially in their careers teachers are concerned about self-protection and consolidation (Self). Later their concerns shift more to the demands of their jobs (Task). Finally, as they mature professionally, their concerns focus on the effects of their teaching on students (Impact). The TCC, then, consists of 56 items which are grouped into three factors: (1) Teacher Self-Concerns; (2) Teacher Task Concerns; and (3) Teacher Impact on Student Learning Concerns. The alpha coefficients are, respectively, .86, .79, .91. Test/retest correlations over a 1-week interval are .87, .80, and .77 for the three factors. Borich and

Fuller (Note 6) report some evidence for the developmental nature of the concerns factors. In one study preservice teachers showed significantly more Self concerns ($p < .001$) and significantly fewer Task concerns ($p < .001$) than inservice teachers. Group difference did not occur on the Impact factor perhaps because both groups responded at the high end of the scale. Though Borich and Fuller (Note 6) report moderate independence of the factors in an early form of the TCC (.23 between Self and Task; .45 between Self and Impact; .55 between Task and Impact), the intercorrelations of the factors in the present study (Hughes & Hukill, Note 5) are considerably higher (.53 between Self and Task; .72 between Self and Impact; .54 between Task and Impact). The particularly high correlation between Self and Impact casts further doubt on the developmental sequence proposed in Concerns Theory.

Background questionnaire. To obtain a general description of the demographic and background characteristics of the participants, a questionnaire was developed. this questionnaire included questions about gender, ethnicity, parents' occupation and education, and birth order. The questionnaire also included questions about the participants' school experience (elementary through graduate training) in terms of the SES, ethnicity, size, and general impression of these experiences. Information was also obtained about current teaching activities, and information about other work experiences. This questionnaire was administered to all participants at the beginning of the semester.

Procedures

Most of the instruments were administered at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience. The Background Questionnaire and the Quick Word Test were administered only at the beginning of the semester as these data were not expected to change during the semester. Repeated measures

ANOVA of the scores by participant role (student teacher or cooperating teacher) revealed few systematic effects due to time. Means were computed, and an hierarchical ANOVA was also performed with the variables entered in the following order: site, participant role, and sample. Likewise, a contingency table analysis was conducted on the nominal and ordinal data of the background questionnaire. Neither set of analyses revealed systematic effects due to site or sample; therefore, the following results section will focus only on the effects due to whether the participant was a student teacher or a cooperating teacher.

Results

Demographics-student teachers. In the sample of student teachers there were 6 males and 87 females. The mean age was 22.68 years with a range from 20 to 47 years. The group of student teachers was predominantly Anglo (76.3%), but included Asians (8.6%), Blacks (6.5%) and Hispanics (7.5%). The majority of the student teachers planned to work at the elementary level (84.9%). The majority (83.9%) also reported having had no teaching experience, but a few (14.0%) indicated that they had had between one and four years of teaching experience.

Information about the student teachers' family background and the communities where they were raised was also obtained. The students reported that their fathers held a variety of occupations: educators (10.7%), professionals (33.3%), white collar (27.4%), skilled labor (26.2%), unskilled labor (2.4%). The mothers of the student teachers were employed as educators (12.9%), professionals (2.4%), white collar jobs (14.4%), skilled labor (17.6%), and unskilled labor (1.2%). Slightly over one-half (51.8%) of the mothers of student teachers did not work outside of the home. The student teachers grew up in many communities with most having lived in suburban areas

(48.4%). Others were reared in urban communities (25.3%), small towns (12.1%), inner cities (9.9%) and rural areas (4.4%).

General information was also obtained regarding the educational backgrounds of the student teachers. Over 70.0% of the student teachers described elementary, junior high and senior high schools they attended as serving students of predominantly middle SES. Less than 11.0% attended an elementary, junior high, or senior high school serving mainly lower SES students, and less than 19.0% attended an elementary, junior high, or senior high school that served mainly upper SES students.

Student teachers also provided information regarding the ethnicity of the schools they attended. Forty-four percent of the student teachers attended elementary schools that were predominantly (over 90.0%) Anglo while 47.3% attended more ethnically mixed elementary schools. Approximately 9.0% of the student teachers attended elementary schools that were either predominantly Black or Hispanic. By junior high the picture had changed rather dramatically. Only 33.0% of the student teachers attended junior high schools that were predominantly (over 90.0%) Anglo, Black, or Hispanic, and 66.7% attended more ethnically mixed junior high schools. The same picture held essentially for senior high schools with only slight variation: 30.0% in predominantly Anglo, Black or Hispanic senior high schools and 69.9% in more ethnically mixed schools. Student teachers also reported their high school ranks. Only 5.4% graduated in the top 2.0% while 39.1% graduated in the top 10.0% of their class, and 34.8% graduated in the top 25.0% of their class.

The college backgrounds of the student teachers indicate that 50.0% went to college at a public university, 47.8% to a private non-religious school and 2.2% to a private religious college for most of their college experience. Most of the student teachers (43.2%) were in an elementary education degree

program, 25.0% in liberal arts programs, and 12.5% in special education. The remaining students were in other areas. Student teachers (92.3%) reported favorable impressions of their colleges. Although 23.6% had obtained some graduate hours, none had obtained graduate degrees.

The student teachers also reported information about their teaching assignments. Most (74.2%) were in medium-sized schools (500-1500), with 15.7% in schools with under 500 students and 10.1% in schools with over 1500 students. These schools were generally located in urban (38.9%) or suburban settings (35.5%), but some were in inner cities (25.6%). Forty-three percent of the student teachers indicated that they were in schools serving predominantly low SES pupils. Forty-eight percent were in predominantly middle SES schools and 8.9% were in predominantly upper SES schools.

Demographics-cooperating teachers. In the sample of cooperating teachers in the two school districts, there were 3 males and 85 females. The mean age of these teachers was 38.9 years with a range from 23 to 63 years of age. In regards to ethnicity, 80.7% were Anglo, 6.8% were Asian, 8.0% were Black and 4.5% were of Hispanic origin. Of those reporting, 96.6% were teaching at the elementary level. The mean number of years of experience accumulated by the cooperating teachers was 14.4 years with a range from one to 35 years.

Information was also obtained about the family background of the cooperating teachers and the communities where they were raised. The occupations of their fathers were educators (8.1%), professionals (25.7%), white collar/management (31.1%), skilled labor (27.7%), and unskilled labor (5.4%). The mothers of the cooperating teachers were employed in the following occupations: 18.8% were teachers, 5.0% were professionals, 11.2% held white collar/management jobs, 12.5% were skilled labor, and none worked in unskilled labor. The remaining 52.5% were housewives. The cooperating

teachers also described the communities in which they were reared: 17.4% in rural, 31.4% in urban, 25.6% in suburban, 2.3% in inner city, and 23.3% in small town environments.

General information was also obtained regarding educational backgrounds of the cooperating teachers. Approximately 80.0% of the cooperating teachers described the elementary, junior high and senior high schools that they attended as serving students of predominantly middle socioeconomic status (SES). Less than 14.0% attended elementary, junior high or senior high schools serving low SES students and less than 13.0% attended elementary, junior high or senior high schools serving upper SES students.

The cooperating teachers also provided information on the ethnicity of the schools they attended. Over two-thirds (69.3%) attended elementary schools that were predominantly Anglo (more than 90.0%) while 8.0% attended predominantly Black elementary schools and 2.3% attended predominantly Hispanic elementary schools. Twenty percent attended more ethnically mixed elementary schools. Although more cooperating teachers attended ethnically mixed junior high schools (40.9%) and senior high schools (46.6%), over half (52.3%) attended predominantly Anglo junior high schools and 47.7% attended predominantly Anglo senior high schools. Only a few attended predominantly Black junior high schools (6.8%) or predominantly Black senior high schools (5.7%). Nearly one-quarter (23.9%) graduated in the top 2.0% of their class while nearly one-half graduated in the top 10.0% of their class.

General information was also obtained regarding colleges attended by cooperating teachers. In this sample 67.0% of the teachers obtained their college education at a public university, 15.9% at a private religious institution, and 17.0% obtained degrees from private non-religious schools. Most of these teachers obtained their degrees in elementary education (47.7%),

but a substantial number also obtained their degrees in English or language arts areas (10.2%), bilingual education (12.5%), and other liberal arts areas (15.9%). The remaining teachers obtained degrees in other areas. Nearly all (97.7%) of the cooperating teachers reported favorable impressions of their colleges. Most of the cooperating teachers had obtained a graduate degree. Of those persons with degrees the majority had obtained Masters of Education degrees (62.9%). One-fifth (20.0%) had obtained a Master of Science degree, 14.3% a Master of Arts degree and 2.9% a Doctor of Education degree.

A description of the schools currently being served by these cooperating teachers and their student teachers was also obtained. Most (67.0%) work in medium-size schools (500-1500), although 19.3% work in small schools (under 500) and 13.6% work in schools with over 1500 students. The communities in which these schools are located include urban (39.1%), suburban (36.8%) and inner city (24.1%) areas. Over one-half (52.9%) of the teachers serve predominantly middle SES students, with 39.1% working with predominantly low SES students and 8.0% with predominantly upper SES students. The teachers ranged in length of service at these schools from 1 to over 15 years.

Participant differences. There were few differences between the student teachers and their cooperating teachers. The differences between the concerns of the participants were somewhat consistent with Fuller's (1969) theory. Consistent with this view, student teachers evinced significantly higher self concerns than the cooperating teachers (Tables 1 and 2). As Fuller asserted, the beginning teacher is preoccupied with him/herself while teachers with more experience generally resolve these self concerns and are more concerned with other matters. Fuller's model also predicts a lessening of self concerns over time. This, too, was borne out in the study (Tables 5 and 10).

Also, according to Fuller's theory, impact concerns arise after the resolution of self concerns. Furthermore, the model predicts that over time task concerns will diminish, to be superceded by impact concerns. This last prediction was only partially supported by the data. Consistent with the model, the cooperating teachers scored significantly higher on impact concerns than the student teachers (Tables 1 and 3). Although the cooperating teachers' task scores diminished over time (Table 5), the trend was not significant (Table 11). Nor was there a corresponding increase in impact concerns. In fact, student teachers scored absolutely, but not significantly, higher than cooperating teachers on impact concerns. Furthermore, both groups' scores diminished over time, though not significantly (Tables 6 and 12).

Both groups evinced high self-esteem scores (Table 1). The student teachers showed significant gain in self-esteem over time, while the cooperating teachers' scores were stable by contrast (Tables 6 and 13). These findings are contrary to those of previous studies (Smith & Smith, 1979; Walberg, 1968) wherein it was shown that student teachers' self-esteem scores diminished over time.

Previous studies have indicated that student teachers become more conservative in their educational philosophy as their student teaching proceeds (Mahan & Lacefield, 1978; Yee, 1969). The present study shows that surprisingly, <u>both</u> cooperating teachers and student teachers became significantly more conservative from fairly progressive initial orientations (Tables 7 and 9).

Another parallelism occurred on the flexibility measure. Both cooperating teachers and student teachers began the year with fairly high

flexibility scores and significantly increased them over the semester (Tables 7 and 8).

In addition to their self-esteem, educational philosophy, and flexibility scores, both groups reported similarly high empathy and locus of control (internal) scores, moderate cognitive style scores, and low conceptual level scores (Table 1). There was no significant change over time on either the empathy or the locus of control measure for either group.

In contrast, the difference between the two groups on the general intelligence measure was striking. The very low scores of the student teachers were significantly lower than those of the cooperating teachers (Tables 1 and 4). Comparison of these scores with norms from college graduates, based on the scores of 4,495 adults attending evening classes across the country in 1962 (Borgatta & Corsini, 1964), revealed the following percentile ranks for the participants of the present study: student teachers-15th, cooperating teachers-50th. Considered as a measure of general intelligence, their performance on the Quick Word Test suggests that student teachers probably do have lower scores on standardized tests than teachers already in the field. Furthermore, only 44% of student teachers reported being in the top 10% of their high school classes, while 71% of cooperating teachers reported being in the top of their classes. Also, 21% of the cooperating teachers reported being members of college honorary societies, whereas only 7.5% of the student teachers were in honor societies.

Average student teacher profile.. Student teachers on the average reported an ability to provide role-appropriate affective interaction to their students. While they believed in their own initiative and control in most matters, they were not extremely indi idualistic. They reported a fairly high ability to adapt to and tolerate change in social, interpersonal settings.

They reported a generally positive level of self-esteem, suggesting that they perceived themselves as effective managers with some opportunities to exercise their authority. This furthermore implied that they perceived their evaluations by others as generally positive. With regard to educational philosophy, the student teachers appeared to be undecided between traditional and progressive orientations. They seemed only moderately concerned with their status at school and with their influence over their students. They reported relatively little concern with the frustrations and stresses often associated with the day-to-day tasks of teaching. These patterns of concern probably realistically reflect their circumscribed role as student teachers. In terms of interpersonal concepts the student teachers reported categorical, rule-bound approaches to their interpersonal relationships. They exhibited a normal degree of field independence. Consistent with a nation-wide trend (Feistritzer, O'Rourke, Howey, Lebby, & Yarger, 1983), the student teachers scored relatively low on the standardized measure of general intelligence.

Average cooperating teacher profile. With a few exceptions the profile of the cooperating teacher appeared to be very similar to that of the student teacher. On the average cooperating teachers reported fewer status concerns at school than student teachers. This finding was not surprising since one would expect the more experienced teachers to have a more secure concept of their role and status in the society of the school than their neophyte counterparts. Also, as one might expect, cooperating teachers appeared to have somewhat greater concern with the day-to-day tasks of teaching and the frustrations and stresses associated with them. As mentioned before, in one of the few differences between them, cooperating teachers scored higher on the standardized measure of general intelligence. Aside from these differences,

cooperating teachers and student teachers appeared to be very similar on the other characteristics measured in this study.

Discussion

There are very few substantive differences between the teachers of today and the teachers for tomorrow. The teachers for tomorrow remain predominantly Anglo and female. They come from predominantly middle-class backgrounds, though substantial numbers of them attended ethnically mixed secondary schools, somewhat more than today's teachers.

The differences that do exist are in the area of workplace concerns primarily, as well as in the expected lower standardized intelligence scores. The difference in the workplace concerns are understandable, given the very different responsibilities, and reward structures confronting the student teachers versus the cooperating teachers. However, with the strong similarities between them on other dimensions, it is likely that the student teachers will behave in their own classrooms similarly to the current teachers, disparities on intelligence scores notwithstanding.

Beyond a few general remarks it is beyond the scope of this discussion to examine the disparity on the Quick Word Test scores between student teachers and cooperating teachers. The trend of declining standardized achievement and aptitude test scores has occurred over a 15-year period, appearing in the general population, not just among student teachers. Obviously, some systematic change is occurring, but its nature remains unclear. Perhaps it is related to a culture-wide deemphasis of printed media and literate discourse (McLuan, 1967). It could be argued that the traditional standardized tests tap linear, logical thought processes and content bound to Anglo, middle-class culture. If the cultural ascendancy of electronic media and nonliterate discourse means that linear, logical thought processes are not as well

developed as before among middle class youth, then the 15 year trend of dropping scores is more understandable. This is an extremely complex phenomena, though, and the preceding comments represent little more than a shot in the dark.

One reason often advanced for the general decline in standardized scores is that increasing numbers from chronically low achieving populations (low SES, ethnic minorities) have been taking standardized tests as a result of various affirmative action initiatives, thus negatively skewing the means. However, if the drop in the student teachers' scores is not disproportionate to that of the general population (controlled for sex, age, and ethnicity), then the sample data would indicate that factors other than class and ethnicity may be operating, as suggested above.

Oddly enough, though, the relationship between general intelligence scores and teacher competence is not well established. Heath (1977) and Kohlberg (1977) have shown that numerous indices of successful adult functioning are not strongly related to standardized IQ scores, nor to GPA. However, this may be an artifact of the relatively pure standardized constructs versus the relatively complex indices of adult functioning. We might well apply the same caveat to the weak relationship of IQ and GPA with indices of successful teaching (Ducharme, 1970). Given this generally uncertain relationship between standardized IQ scores and behavior, unequivocal implications cannot be drawn regarding the student teachers' low intelligence scores, disturbing though they may be.

The point here is that aside from achievement/aptitude scores' trends, the teachers for tomorrow remain astonishingly like those of today with regard to personal and professional characteristics, ethnicity (Anglo), sex (female), SES (middle class), and postsecondary education (education majors). When

change over time did occur, the two groups tended to parallel each other. Thus, in many dimensions deemed important to the practice of teaching we can expect that the new teachers will probably carry on in much the same way as their predecessors have. This conclusion, of course, raises questions about the significance of standardized aptitude and intelligence test scores and their decline, especially among new teachers. What does the weak relationship between performance on aptitude or intelligence tests and teacher performance mean? Given the rather dramatic social, political, and economic trends of the last two decades, how do we account for the apparent similarities between the current teachers and the newcomers? Is this continuity desirable? Finally, what implication do answers to these questions have for teacher education programs?

In light of the current findings it seems that those who endeavor to teach are similar on numerous dimensions. However, significant differences may emerge after further studies. Certainly the findings from this single study must be interpreted with caution. In any event it seems clear that teaching and the preparation of teachers are complex, multifaceted processes which we have only begun to fathom.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Personality, Attitude, Cognitive, and Professional Measures by Participant Type

	Student Teacher $\bar{X}$	Student Teacher s.d.	Cooperating Teacher $\bar{X}$	Cooperating Teacher s.d.
Empathy	124.93	11.06	123.78	12.15
Locus of Control	33.98	5.04	33.53	4.49
Flexibility	72.85	11.35	71.54	11.36
Educational Preference Scale	99.66	12.68	99.05	11.59
Teacher Concerns Checklist				
Self	67.81	13.80	55.88	15.26
Task	19.72	5.60	21.35	5.15
Impact	110.69	21.16	106.35	21.11
Self-Esteem	125.13	9.78	123.99	10.44
Conceptual Level	1.43	.30	1.47	.34
Cognitive Style	12.35	4.12	12.95	4.25
Vocabulary/Intelligence	46.98	13.34	66.21	16.35

Table 2

Summary of ANOVA of
Teacher Concerns Self Subscale
by Site, Participant Type,
and Sample

Source	SS	dF	MS	F
Site	.059	1	.059	.000
Participant Type	5968.059	2	2984.030	13.914*
Sample	120.064	1	120.064	.560
Site X Participant Type	300.858	2	150.429	.701
Site X Sample	306.717	1	306.717	1.430
Participant Type X Sample	58.618	2	29.309	.137
Site X Participant Type X Sample	63.464	1	63.464	.296
Residual	40103.204	187	214.456	
Total	47076.617	197	238.968	

*$p < .01$

Table 3

Summary of ANOVA of
Teacher Concerns Task Subscale
by Site, Participant Type,
and Sample

Source	SS	dF	MS	F
Site	105.270	1	105.270	4.719*
Participant Type	137.683	2	68.842	3.086*
Sample	42.648	1	42.648	1.912
Site X Participant Type	2.748	2	1.374	.062
Site X Sample	16.946	1	16.946	.760
Participant Type X Sample	14.808	2	7.404	3.320
Site X Participant Type X Sample	3.837	1	3.837	.172
Residual	3859.283	173	22.308	
Total	4186.703	183	22.878	

*$p < .05$

Table 4

Summary of ANOVA of Quick Word Test Scores by Site, Participant Type, and Sample

Source	SS	dF	MS	F
Site	140.689	1	140.689	.632
Participant Type	16698.681	1	16689.681	75.022*
Sample	336.362	1	336.362	1.511
Site X Participant Type	295.346	1	295.346	1.327
Site X Sample	216.511	1	216.511	.973
Participant Type X Sample	1.199	1	1.199	.005
Site X Participant Type X Sample	98.506	1	98.506	.443
Residual	38284.278	172	222.583	
Total	56078.311	179	313.287	

*$p < .01$

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of the Repeated Measures of Teacher Concerns Checklist Self and Task Factors by Participant Type

Construct	Administrations					
	Beginning-of-Semester		Mid-Semester		End-of-Semester	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
TCC Self						
Cooperating Teacher	56.22	15.79	56.63	14.81	54.77	15.19
Student Teacher	69.71	13.00	67.57	13.27	66.13	15.13
TCC Task						
Cooperating Teacher	21.39	5.24	21.86	4.70	20.81	5.52
Student Teacher	19.50	5.66	19.93	5.57	19.74	5.57

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of the Repeated Measures of Teacher Concerns Checklist Impact Factor and Self-Esteem by Participant Type

Construct	Administrations					
	Beginning-of-Semester		Mid-Semester		End-of-Semester	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
TCC Impact						
Cooperating Teacher	107.17	22.14	107.41	19.74	104.48	21.46
Student Teacher	111.90	20.83	110.20	20.31	109.95	22.33
Self-Esteem						
Cooperating Teacher	123.80	10.46	123.84	11.18	124.33	9.69
Student Teacher	123.26	10.23	125.36	10.02	126.79	9.10

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of the Repeated Measures of Flexibility and Educational Preference by Participant Type

Construct	Administrations					
	Beginning-of-Semester		Mid-Semester		End-of-Semester	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Flexibility						
Cooperating Teacher	70.39	10.15	71.58	11.63	72.65	12.29
Student Teacher	71.18	11.02	73.69	11.28	73.69	11.75
Educational Preference						
Cooperating Teacher	100.82	11.49	98.39	10.84	97.94	12.43
Student Teacher	101.28	13.09	99.07	12.45	98.63	12.52

Table 8

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA of Flexibility Scores by Participant Role

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Role	218.432	1	218.432	.658
Time	529.003	2	264.502	9.396*
Role x Time	41.559	2	20.779	.738
Error-Role	55069.519	166	331.744	
Error-Time	9345.699	332	28.150	

* $p < .01$

Table 9

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA of
Educational Preference Scores by Participant Role

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Role	46.024	1	46.024	.131
Time	726.286	2	363.143	7.785*
Role x Time	1.389	2	.695	.015
Error-Role	57118.732	163	350.422	
Error-Time	15207.346	326	46.648	

* $p < .01$

Table 10

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA of
Self Concerns by Participant Role

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Role	17825.715	1	17825.715	33.937*
Time	545.471	2	272.736	4.917*
Role x Time	157.647	2	78.824	1.421
Error-Role	86667.280	165	525.256	
Error-Time	18303.898	330	55.466	

* $p < .01$

Table 11

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA of
Task Concerns Scores by Participant Role

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Role	331.613	1	331.613	4.973*
Time	34.196	2	17.098	1.677
Role x Time	19.537	2	9.769	.958
Error-Role	11001.825	165	66.678	
Error-Time	3363.828	330	10.193	

* $p < .05$

Table 12

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA of
Impact Concerns Scores by Participant Role

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Role	2351.573	1	2351.573	2.184
Time	469.742	2	234.871	1.767
Role x Time	159.841	2	79.921	.601
Error-Role	177659.800	165	1076.726	
Error-Time	43871.241	330	132.943	

Table 13

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA of Self-Esteem Scores by Participant Role

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Role	156.572	1	156.572	.639
Time	327.570	2	163.785	5.281*
Role x Time	187.503	2	93.752	3.023**
Error-Role	38694.729	158	244.903	
Error-Time	9799.850	316	31.012	

* $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

Reference Notes

1. Griffin, G.A., Barnes, S., Hughes, Jr., R., O'Neal, S., Defino, M.E., Edwards, S.A., & Hukill, H.M. Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study (Report No. 9025). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, February, 1983.
2. Lacefield, W. E., & Cole, H. P. Starting point for curricular change: A predisposition and suitability measure for client groups. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.
3. Hughes, R., Jr., Griffin, G. A., & Defino, M. E. Personality factors in the student teaching triad. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 1982.
4. Witkin, H. A., Goodenough, D. R., & Oltman, P. K. Psychological differentiation: Current status (ETS RB 77-17). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1977.
5. Hughes, R., Jr., & Hukill, H. Participant characteristics, change, and outcomes in preservice clinical teacher education (Report No. 9020). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, July 1982.
6. Borich, G. D., & Fuller, F. F. Teacher concerns checklist: An instrument for measuring concerns for self, task, and impact. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

References

Borgatta, E. F., & Corsini, R. J. Quick word test manual. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Borich, G., & Paver, S. W. Convergent and discriminant validity of the locus of control construct. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70, 119-128.

Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 81-105.

Carkhuff, R. The development of human resources. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1971.

Cogan, M. L. Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Ducharme, R.J. Selected preservice factors related to success of the beginning teacher. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1970.

Ekstrom, R. Teacher aptitude, knowledge, attitudes, and cognitive style as predictors of teaching behavior. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 329-331.

Feistritzer, C.E., O'Rourke, L.M., Howey, K.R., Lebby, A.M., & Yarger, S.J. (Eds.). The American Teacher. Washington, DC: Feistritzer Publications, 1983.

Fuller, F. F. Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Garvey, R. Self-concept and success in student teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 1970, 21, 357-361.

Goldhammer, R. Clinical supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1964.

Grotelveschen, A., & Knox, A. B. Analysis of quick word test as an estimate of adult mental ability. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1967, 4, 169-176.

Guilford, J. P. The nature of human intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Harvey, O. J., Hunt, D., & Schroder, H. M. Conceptual systems and personality organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1961.

Harvey, O. J., Prather, M. J., White, B., Alter, R. O., & Hoffmeister, J. K. Teachers' belief systems and preschool atmospheres. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57, 373-381.

Heath, D. Maturity and competence. New York: Gardner, 1977.

Hunt, D. E. Person-environment interaction: A challenge found wanting before it was tried. Review of Educational Research, 1975, 45I, 209-230.

Hunt, D. E., & Joyce, B. R. Teacher trainee personality and initial teaching style. American Educational Research Journal, 1967, 4, 253-259.

Hunt, D. E., Joyce, B. R., Greenwood, J. A., Noy, J. E., Reid, R., & Weil, M. Student conceptual levels and models of teaching: Theoretical and empirical coordination of two models. Interchange, 1974, 53, 19-30.

Joyce, B. R., Weil, M., & Wald, R. The teacher-innovator: Models of teaching as the core of teacher education. Interchange, 1973, 4(2/3), 47-60.

Kohlberg, L. Moral development, ego development, and psycho-educational practices. In D. Miller (Ed.) Developmental theory. St. Paul, MN: Department of Education, 1977.

Lacefield, W. E., & Mahan, J. M. A. Longitudinal study of attitude change and teacher training. Educational Research Quarterly, 1980, 5, 2-12.

LaMonica, E. L. Construct validity of an empathy instrument. Research in Nursing and Health, 1981, 4, 389-400.

Mahan, J. M., & Lacefield, W. Educational attitude changes during year-long student teaching. Journal of Experimental Education, 1978, 46, 4-15.

McLuan, M. The medium is the message. New York: Bantam, 1967.

Milgram, R. M., & Milgram, N. Self-concept differences in student teachers in primary, secondary, and special education. Psychology in the Schools, 1976, 13, 439-441.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A nation at risk - The report of the national commission on excellence in education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Rayder, N. F., Abrams, A. L., & Larson, J. C. Effect of socio-contextual variables on child achievement. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 58-63.

Rehfish, J. Some scale and test correlates of a personality rigidity scale. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 372-374.

Robinson, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research, 1973.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, (1, Whole No. 609).

Schroder, H. M., Driver, M. J., & Streufert, S. Human information processing. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967.

Soares, A. T., & Soares, L. M. Self-perception inventory: Composite test manual. Bridgeport, CT: Also Corporation, 1980.

Soares, A. T., & Soares, L. M. Self-perceptions of student teachers and the meaningfulness of their experience. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 187-191.

Smith, S.D., & Smith, W.D. Teaching the poor: Its effect on student teacher self-concept. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 45-49.

Walberg, H.J. Personality-role conflict and self-conception in urban practice teachers. The School Review, 1968, 76, 41-48.

Willis, P. E. Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Witkin, H. A., Oltman, P. K., Raskin, E., & Karp, S. A. A manual for the embedded figures tests. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1971.

Yarger, S. J., Howey, K., & Joyce, B. Reflections on preservice preparation: Impressions from the national survey. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 34-37.

Yee, A.H. Do cooperating teachers influence the attitude of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 327-332.